

## REMARKS

Claims 4 and 11 have been amended. New Claim 12 has been added. Claims 1-3, and 5-10 have been canceled. Claims 4, 11, and 12 remain in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested. The Examiner's comments are shown in bold.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

**Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutton et al '543.**

The Applicant has canceled Claims 1-3 and 5-10.

**Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grose '399.**

The Applicant has canceled Claims 1-3 and 5-10.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

**Claims 4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.**

The Applicant has rewritten Claims 4 and 11 in independent form.

#### Regarding New Claim 12:

New Claim 12 is a narrowed version of canceled Claim 5 in which the following additional limitations have been added:

*-a single elongated member. . .*

*-said elongated member having a length which is greater than one half the length of the mattress;*

*-wherein said elongated member may be positioned between the mattress and the box spring substantially parallel to the sides of the mattress . . .*

None of the cited prior art references teach or suggest these limitations. Therefore in accordance with MPEP 2131 (all claim elements not taught), the Applicant submits that Claim 12 distinguishes from the cited prior art and should be allowable.

The Applicant honestly believes that the structure of the present invention as recited in new Claim 12 differs substantially from that of the cited prior art. In this amendment the Applicant has attempted to add claim limitations which recite these structural differences. However, it is not always possible to present those limitations in a manner acceptable to the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant would also appreciate any comments by the Examiner as to what specific claim language could be utilized to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Form PTO-948 was not included in the Office Action, therefore the Applicant assumes that the drawings are acceptable.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all the claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ted Masters', written in a cursive style.

Ted Masters Reg. 36,209  
23344 8th St  
Newhall, CA 91321

(661) 255-2333